



Shortening the gauge argument

Alexander Afriat

► To cite this version:

| Alexander Afriat. Shortening the gauge argument. 2013. hal-00769691

HAL Id: hal-00769691

<https://hal.science/hal-00769691>

Preprint submitted on 3 Jan 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Shortening the gauge argument

Alexander Afriat

January 3, 2013

Abstract

The “gauge argument” is often used to ‘deduce’ interactions from a symmetry requirement. A transition—whose justification can take some effort—from global to local transformations is typically made at the beginning of the argument. But one can spare the trouble by *starting* with local transformations, as global ones do not exist in general. The resulting economy seems noteworthy.

1 The gauge argument

One begins with a free field, of Dirac four-spinors $\psi \in \mathbb{C}^4$ for instance. The Dirac Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i\not{\partial} - m)\psi$ is invariant under the *global* transformation

$$(1) \quad \psi \mapsto e^{i\kappa}\psi$$

(whose existence is assumed for the time being), where “global” means that κ is the same everywhere. It is then argued¹ that \mathcal{L} should also be invariant under the *local* transformation

$$(2) \quad \psi \mapsto \psi_\zeta = e^{i\zeta}\psi,$$

where $\zeta : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function on the base manifold M .

Most immediately what are we to make of the initial, central demand of local gauge invariance? The demand is anything but self-evident and presumably, in the context of the gauge argument, must be argued for on some

¹Göckeler & Schücker (1987) p. 48: “In physical terms we may interpret the requirement of local gauge invariance (independence of the fields at different spacetime points) as expressing the absence of (instantaneous) action at a distance.” Ryder (1996) p. 93: “So when we perform a rotation in the internal space of φ at one point, through an angle Λ , we must perform the same rotation *at all other points at the same time*. If we take this physical interpretation seriously, we see that it is impossible to fulfil, since it contradicts the letter and spirit of relativity, according to which there must be a minimum time delay equal to the time of light travel. To get round this problem we simply abandon the requirement that Λ is a constant, and write it as an arbitrary function of space-time, $\Lambda(x^\mu)$. This is called a ‘local’ gauge transformation, since it clearly differs from point to point.” Teller (2000) p. S469: “why should we expect invariance under a local phase transformation to begin with? The plausibility of such invariance probably arises with a misleading analogy with global phase transformations which can be imposed on individual state functions with no change of description.” See also Sakurai (1967, p. 16), Aitchison & Hey (1982, p. 176), Mandl & Shaw (1984, p. 263), Ramond (1990, pp. 183-91), O’Raifeartaigh (1997, p. 118). One is reminded of Weyl’s rejection (1929a, p. 331; 1929b, p. 286) of distant parallelism.

basis. Unlike the global invariance, the demand for the corresponding local invariance does not have an immediate physical counterpart. Is it to be taken as a direct implementation of some sort of unassailable first principle? If so, is the demand (or principle) something with which we are already familiar only in a different form?

A common justification for the demand of local gauge invariance in presenting the gauge argument is to present it as some sort of “locality” requirement. In outline, the “gauge locality argument” is that global gauge invariance is somehow at odds with the idea of a local field theory, and that to remedy this we must instead require local gauge invariance. This rather brief argument is just how Yang and Mills motivated the demand in their seminal 1954 paper,² very much setting the tone for subsequent treatments. Just what to make of this argument is not clear, however, there are many interrelated senses of locality that might be at issue. (Martin, 2002, p. S225)

One gathers at any rate that considerable and varied efforts have been devoted to the transition from (1) to (2).

As things stand the Lagrangian is not invariant, because of the derivative in the first term of $\mathcal{L}_\zeta = i\bar{\psi}_\zeta \not{\partial} \psi_\zeta - m\bar{\psi}\psi$. Writing

$$\bar{\psi}_\zeta \not{\partial} \psi_\zeta = \bar{\psi} e^{-i\zeta} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu e^{i\zeta} \psi = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu + i\partial_\mu \zeta) \psi$$

we see that $\mathcal{L}_\zeta = \bar{\psi} [i\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu + i\partial_\mu \zeta) - m] \psi$ has the derivative $\partial_\mu + i\partial_\mu \zeta$ instead of ∂_μ . To offset (2) we therefore have to *subtract* the term $i\partial_\mu \zeta$ that alters \mathcal{L} , yielding the covariant differential $D = d - id\zeta$ with components $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\partial_\mu \zeta$. Writing $\not{D} = \gamma^\mu D_\mu$, the balanced Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}' = \bar{\psi}_\zeta (i\not{D} - m) \psi_\zeta$ will be equal to \mathcal{L} for all ζ . Another way of seeing that differentiation has to be balanced by $d\zeta$ to offset (2): The momentum operator P becomes $-id$ in the position representation; applied to ψ_ζ it gives $-id\psi_\zeta = e^{i\zeta} (-id + d\zeta) \psi_\zeta$, in other words $UPU^\dagger U\psi = P_\zeta \psi_\zeta$, the position representation of the rotated momentum operator P_ζ being $-id + d\zeta$.³

It is then argued that an interaction $F = dA = d^2\zeta$ is thereby deduced,⁴ whose potential A is $d\zeta$. But since d^2 vanishes the interaction does too, as has often been

²Yang & Mills (1954) p. 192: “It seems that this [(1) but with $\mathbb{SU}(2)$ instead of $\mathbb{U}(1)$] is not consistent with the localized field concept that underlies the usual physical theories.”

³My analysis owes much to Lyre (2001, 2002, 2004a,b). But

$$\langle \varphi | P | \varphi \rangle = \langle \varphi U | U P U^\dagger | U \varphi \rangle \neq \langle \varphi U | P | U \varphi \rangle$$

seems relevant to his claim (2004b, pp. 649-51) that local phase transformations are not observable. I would say they *are*—unless one compensates to restore invariance. P. 651 he writes that: “local phase transformations are already unmasked as *not* observable. From this insight, however, the whole logic of the received view breaks down. Since the introduction of an interaction field as intended by the received view seemingly changes physics (those fields are even directly observable themselves), it is necessary from this view to consider local gauge transformations as changing physics as well in order to tell the story about compensation. Since, however, local gauge transformations can be shown as not observable, the received view proves itself untenable.” It is untenable because the added term $d\zeta$ is exact. But even if $d\zeta$ is *electromagnetically* unobservable, it is *quantum-mechanically* observable: $\langle \varphi | P | \varphi \rangle \neq \langle \varphi | P_\zeta | \varphi \rangle$.

⁴Ryder (1996) p. 95: “the electromagnetic field arises *naturally* by demanding invariance of the action [...] under *local* (x -dependent) rotations [...]”

pointed out.⁵

The gauge argument is fertile enough to produce another two Lagrangians,⁶

$$\mathcal{L}_A = j \wedge A = j^\mu A_\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu A_\mu \psi \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_F = F \wedge *F = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu},$$

where the current density three-form

$$j = \frac{1}{3!} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma\tau} j^\mu dx^\nu \wedge dx^\sigma \wedge dx^\tau$$

corresponds to the vector with components $j^\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi$. One can either leave $A = d\zeta$ in \mathcal{L}' to offset (2), or balance \mathcal{L}_ζ with \mathcal{L}_A in the sum $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}_\zeta + \mathcal{L}_A$. Again, a Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_F derived from the gauge argument will vanish. But once the gauge argument has produced the exact potential $A = d\zeta$ and vanishing interaction $F = dA = d^2\zeta$ one can perhaps claim that A is no longer exact. The exact term $d\zeta$ would then be subtracted from one that isn't⁷ in the gauge transformation

$$(3) \quad A \mapsto A' = A - d\zeta.$$

The total Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}' + \mathcal{L}_F$ is indifferent to (2) and (3).

2 Global and local gauge transformations

Let us return to the global transformation (1), which adds the same angle κ everywhere on M . To do so one has to know where to start, there has to be an identity $\mathbb{1} = e^{i0} \in \mathbb{U}(1)$ *everywhere*, a *global* identity \mathcal{J} , of the gauge group \mathcal{G} . The structure group $G = \mathbb{U}(1)$ is there to act on the typical fiber, which here is \mathbb{C}^4 ; at a point $x \in M$, the identity $\mathbb{1}$ is the element that leaves any $\psi_x \in \mathbb{C}_x^4$ unaltered; the global identity $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{G}$ would leave a *global section* unaltered. But to leave a global section unaltered there has to be one in the first place. Since global sections do not exist in general,⁸ the global gauge transformation (1) doesn't either, so the gauge argument can start with (2): “for the Lagrangian to remain invariant, the transformation (2) has to be balanced by the exact term $d\zeta$ yielding the vanishing interaction $d^2\zeta$ ” and so on. The argument remains contrived and unconvincing, but at least the exertions needed to reach (2) from (1) are spared. The local transformation (2) may (or may not) require justification in

⁵Auyang (1995, p. 58), Brown (1999, pp. 50-3), Teller (2000, pp. S468-9), Lyre (2001, 2002, 2004a,b), Healey (2001, p. 438), Martin (2002, p. S229), Martin (2003, p. 45), Catren (2008, pp. 512, 520). But the general *structure* of the covariant derivative is about right; Lyre (2002) p. 84: “Denn wenngleich das Eichprinzip [...] nicht zwingend auf nichtflache Konnektionen führt, so ist ja doch die in der kovarianten Ableitung vorgegebene Struktur des Wechselwirkungsterms auch für den empirisch bedeutsamen Fall nichtverschwindender Feldstärken korrekt beschrieben. Diese *Wechselwirkungsstruktur* ist also tatsächlich aus der lokalen Eichsymmetrie-Forderung hergeleitet.”

⁶Cf. Weyl (1929b, p. 283).

⁷One can wonder what the gauge argument is for if the inexact potential A was already there to begin with. The exact term subtracted in (3) has more to do with the invariance of $F = dA = dA'$ than with the gauge argument.

⁸See Göckeler & Schücker (1987, §9.7) for instance. The matter is of course topological—a simply-connected base manifold M admits global sections.

itself, regardless of context—but much less at any rate than if it is preceded by (1), which appears to represent a ‘harmless’ transformation from which effort is needed to reach and justify the ‘troublesome’ transformation (2). If (1) doesn’t exist, (2) is neither troublesome nor harmless but all there is.

Of course (1) would—if available—be the natural place to start, as it corresponds to the only normal operator N such that $\mathcal{L}(\psi) = \mathcal{L}(N\psi)$ without tinkering. The next most harmless normal operator is the unitary operator, whose action⁹ is given by (2); the progression from (1) to (2) would therefore be entirely natural. But now that we’re no longer starting with (1), (2) is no longer the natural successor of an equally natural initial transformation, so why start with (2)? Because the only alternative is the transformation $\psi \mapsto z\psi$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}$) corresponding to the most general normal operator—from which it is too hard to salvage the Lagrangian

$$i\bar{z}\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(z\partial_\mu + \partial_\mu z)\psi + m|z|^2\bar{\psi}\psi.$$

References

- Aitchison, I. J. R. and A. J. G. Hey (1982) *Gauge theories in particle physics*, Hilger, Bristol
- Auyang, S. Y. (1995) *How is quantum field theory possible?*, Oxford University Press
- Brown, H. (1999) “Aspects of objectivity in quantum mechanics” pp. 45-70 in J. Butterfield and C. Pagonis (editors) *From physics to philosophy*, Cambridge University Press
- Catren, G. (2008) “Geometric foundations of classical Yang-Mills theory” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **39**, 511-31
- Göckeler, M. and T. Schücker (1987) *Differential geometry, gauge theories, and gravity*, Cambridge University Press
- Healey, R. (2001) “On the reality of gauge potentials” *Philosophy of Science* **68**, 432-55
- Lyre, H. (2001) “The principles of gauging” *Philosophy of Science* **68**, S371-81
- Lyre, H. (2002) “Zur Wissenschaftstheorie moderner Eichfeldtheorien” in A. Beckermann and C. Nimtz (editors) *Argument & Analyse – Sektionsvorträge*, Mentis, Paderborn
- Lyre, H. (2004a) *Lokale Symmetrien und Wirklichkeit: eine Naturphilosophische Studie über Eichtheorien und Strukturenrealismus*, Mentis, Paderborn
- Lyre, H. (2004b) “Holism and structuralism in $U(1)$ gauge theory” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **35**, 643-70

⁹In its ‘diagonal’ eigenrepresentation, in which the kernel becomes the multiplication operator $e^{i\zeta}$, with just one variable.

- Mandl, F. and G. Shaw (1984) *Quantum field theory*, Wiley, Chichester
- Martin, C. (2002) “Gauge principles, gauge arguments and the logic of nature” *Philosophy of Science* **69**, S221-34
- Martin, C. (2003) “On continuous symmetries and the foundations of modern physics” pp. 29-60 in K. Brading and E. Castellani (editors) *Symmetries in physics: Philosophical reflections*, Cambridge University Press
- O’Raifeartaigh, L. (1997) *The dawning of gauge theory*, Princeton University Press
- Ramond, P. (1990) *Field theory: a modern primer*, Westview Press, Boulder
- Ryder, L. (1996) *Quantum field theory*, Cambridge University Press
- Sakurai, J. J. (1967) *Advanced quantum mechanics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading
- Teller, P. (2000) “The gauge argument” *Philosophy of Science* **67**, S466-81
- Weyl, H. (1929a) “Elektron und Gravitation” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **56**, 330-52
- Weyl, H. (1929b) “Gravitation and the electron” *The Rice Institute Pamphlet* **16**, 280-95
- Yang, C. N. and R. Mills (1954) “Conservation of isotopic spin and isotopic gauge invariance”